

POLICY ON SCHOLARLY INTEGRITY
(Researchers not subject to the
Faculty and Librarian Collective Agreement)

University Policy No.: AC1105 (A)
Classification: Academic and Students
Approving Authority: Board of Governors
Effective Date: June 2023
Supersedes: December 2012
Last Editorial Change: April 2021
Mandated Review: December 2019

1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 The university is a place of education and scholarly enquiry. Our professional ethics require us as individuals and as an institution to adhere to principles of scholarly integrity and of respect for our students, staff and colleagues. The university undertakes to review and inquire into allegations of scholarly misconduct in a timely, impartial, and accountable manner and take appropriate action when it finds that scholarly misconduct has occurred.

2.0 Scope

- 2.1 This policy applies to all matters of scholarly integrity conducted by Researchers in their university-related work and/or their use of University resources. Researchers include:
- (a) faculty members and librarians not represented by the Faculty Association;
 - (b) adjunct, affiliate, and honorary (including emeritus) professors;
 - (c) graduate and undergraduate students;
 - (d) vsvsof The policy also applies to the scholarly integrity of individuals providing services to the University under a contract for services or a written agreement.

- 3.4 “**Dean**” includes Head of the Division of Medical Sciences or the University Librarian if the Respondent is a librarian.
- 3.5 “**Inquiry**” means the process described in s. 9.
- 3.6 “**Respondent**” means a person in respect of whom an allegation of misconduct in a Scholarly Activity has been made.
- 3.7 “**Review**” means the process described in s. 8.
- 3.8 “**Reviewer**” means a person appointed to conduct the Review described in s. 8.
- 3.9 “**Scholarly Activity**” includes all activities by Researchers that are appropriate for inclusion in a curriculum vitae as scholarship, research (including graduate student supervision), or other creative activity.
- 3.10 “**Tri-Agency**” means the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), sponsors of the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research* which informs this policy.
- 3.11 “**Working day(s)**” means Monday to Friday, except statutory holidays and University-wide closures.

4.0 Scholarly Activity

- 4.1 Researchers engaged in Scholarly A engi

- (a) Scholarly and scientific rigour in proposing and performing research; in recording, analyzing, and interpreting data; and in reporting and publishing data and findings.
- (b) Keeping complete and accurate records of data, methodologies and findings, including graphs and images, in accordance with the applicable funding agency or agreement, institutional policies, laws, regulations, and professional or disciplinary standards in a manner that will allow verification or replication of the work by others.
- (c) Referencing and, where applicable, obtaining permission for the use of all published and unpublished work, including theories, concepts, data, source material, methodologies, findings, graphs and images.
- (d) Including as authors, with their consent, all those and only those who have made a substantial contribution to, and who accept responsibility for, the contents of the publication or document. The substantial contribution may be conceptual or material.,
- (e) Acknowledging appropriately all those and only those who have contributed to research, including funders and sponsors.
- (f) Appropriately

7.2 Anyone who makes an allegation of scholarly misconduct should recognize the seriousness of making such an allegation. Where an allegation made by a University employee or student is found to be trivial, vexatious or frivolous, the University will take disciplinary action within existing policies and procedures against the individual who made the allegation. A complainant who is known to the University and is making the Complaint in good faith or a person providing information related to a Complaint shall be protected, to the extent possible, from reprisals in a manner consistent with relevant legislation.

7.3 A Complaint containing allegations of scholarly misconduct shall be forwarded to the Office of the

8.0 Reviews

- 8.1 Where a Complaint falls within the definition of scholarly misconduct in s. 5 (except as in 7.8)

(b)

The Respondent shall be given the opportunity to respond fully to the evidence presented in writing. Ethical or research guidelines of a professional organization of which the Respondent is a member and which are applicable to the subject matter of the Complaint are admissible as evidence before the Committee of Inquiry and may be considered by the Committee in making any decision or recommendation.

9.9 In the case of a hearing, the Respondent may be accompanied by an advisor if the Respondent so desires. The Respondent shall have the opportunity to question witnesses presented to the Committee of Inquiry and the opportunity to call witnesses on behalf of the Respondent.

9.10

- 9.14 The Committee's finding under s. 9.11 may be appealed by the Respondent in accordance with the following requirements and procedures:
- (a) The Respondent will advise the Vice-President Research and Innovation of the appeal and the basis for the appeal in writing no later than ten (10) Working days from the Respondent receiving the Committee's findings.
 - (b) The Respondent may only appeal on the following grounds, or a combination thereof:
 - i. that the Committee's process failed to follow the principles of natural justice or procedural fairness;
 - ii. that the Committee failed to materially address one or more of the Respondent's statements of defence;
 - iii. that the Committee's decision shows evidence of bias; or
 - iv. that new information, not previously available to the Respondent, has been discovered, which addresses one or more of the reasons for the Committee's finding.
 - (c) Failure by the Respondent to identify one or more grounds of appeal as outlined in (b) above will result in summary dismissal of the appeal by the Vice-President Research and Innovation.
 - (d) The appeal will be heard by a new Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Vice-President Research and Innovation in accordance with 9.3.

9.15 The appeal will be determined on the basis of written submissions alone and in accordance with the principles of natural justice and procedural fairness.

9.16 Denial of an appeal under c) above, and any decision by the appeal committee, is final and is not subject to grievance.

9.17 Within five (5) Working days of receipt of the Investigative Report, the Administrative Authority shall provide copies of the Investigation Report to the Respondent, the complainant and the Vice-President Research and Innovation and the Vice-President Academic and Provost with notice to the Respondent and the Dean and complainant as to whether the Complaint was substantiated. Where the Complaint is substantiated, the Administrative Authority shall also advise the Respondent whether discipline will be initiated.

9.18 Where the Complaint is not substantiated, the Administrative Authority in consultation with the Respondent and in light of any recommendations made by the Committee of Inquiry shall take all reasonable steps to repair any damage that the Respondent's reput

